

Public Disclosure Commission 2007-09 Strategic Plan

May 2006

Mission Statement

The Public Disclosure Commission was created and empowered by Initiative of the People to

- provide timely and meaningful public access to information about the financing of political campaigns, lobbyist expenditures, and the financial affairs of public officials and candidates, and
- ensure compliance with and equitable enforcement of Washington's disclosure and campaign finance laws.

Vision Statement

We build public confidence in the political process and government.

Statutory Authority

The Public Disclosure Commission is created pursuant to RCW 42.17.350. The Commission's powers and duties are set forth in RCW 42.17.360, 42.17.365, 42.17.367, 42.17.370, 42.17.395 and other provisions of chapter 42.17 RCW.

Goals and Objectives

1. Identify and implement strategies to make prevention and enforcement efforts more effective; evaluate results.

Objective: Increase compliance without enforcement action.

Strategy: Emphasize prevention over enforcement through audits and customer service.
[Statewide Result No. 10. Activity: Enforcement of RCW 42.17.]

Action Items:

- 1-1 Prevent party county central committee reporting problems by 1) contacting chairs on annual basis regarding reporting, and 2) sending reminders in June.

Who: Communications and Training Officer

Timeline: February and June annually

- 1-2 Consistent with RCW 42.17.370(10), examine whether to have reporting modification request renewals considered at single commissioner hearings.

Who: Commission, Executive Director, Senior Counsel

Timeline: July 2007

- 1-3 Enhance enforcement database to better track penalties that are assessed and the circumstances that resulted in the assessment.

Who: Assistant Director, Director of Compliance

Timeline: September 2007

- 1-4 Further automate process for identifying and communicating with non-filers.

Who: Assistant Director, Chief Technology Officer, Director of Compliance, Communications and Training Officer

Timeline: December 2007

Objective: Reinforce the cause and effect relationship between violations and sanctions.

Strategy: Examine penalties and other enforcement options.
[Statewide Result No. 10. Activity: Enforcement of RCW 42.17.]

Action Items:

- 1-5 Revise penalties and approaches to promote reporting compliance by citizens participating in unpaid government service. Consider non-monetary penalty options.
Who: Assistant Director, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Director of Compliance
Timeline: October 2007
- 1-6 Modify website for easy tracking of enforcement cases.
Who: Communications and Training Officer, Application Developer, and other members of the website design committee
Timeline: March 2008
- 1-7 Modify delinquent penalty collection process by implementing efficiencies.
Who: Administrative Officer
Timeline: September 2007

2. Provide quick and easy public access to information; evaluate results.

Objective: Increase information available to voters.

Strategy: Improve usability of website and “get to three clicks.”*

**The concept is that web access will be quick and easy as illustrated by a web visitor typically using no more than three clicks to find the information he or she seeks.*

[Statewide Result No. 10. Activity: Provide Public Access to Campaign, Lobbying and Financial Information.]

Action Items:

- 2-1 Complete next phase of ORCA enhancements and upgrades.
Who: Chief Technology Officer, Lead Application Developer
Timeline: July 2008
- 2-2 Enhance online filing systems for lobbyists, lobbyist employers, personal financial affairs, C-6 filers, and jurisdictions submitting lists of officials.
Who: Chief Technology Officer, Quality Assurance Manager, Application Developer
Timeline: Ongoing

- 2-3 Publish online training videos and other help programs for filers.
Who: Chief Technology Officer, Systems Administrator,
Communications and Training Officer
Timeline: March 2008
- 2-4 Develop and implement a subscription service to alert subscribers when
a new report has been received from a specified lobbyist or campaign.
Who: Chief Technology Officer, Lead Application Developer
Timeline: July 2008
- 2-5 Replace manual data entry of candidate declaration information with
electronic data transfers from the Secretary of State's Office and
election officials in King, Pierce and Snohomish counties.
Who: Assistant Director, Chief Technology Officer
Timeline: June 2009
- 2-6 Update content and look of the 2008 Fact Book.
Who: Administrative Officer
Timeline: June 2009
- 2-7 Make all web information accessible to persons with disabilities.
Who: Chief Technology Officer
Timeline: January 2008
- 2-8 Supplement Crystal reports with online query system of lobbyist data.
Who: Chief Technology Officer, Lead Application Developer
Timeline: January 2009
- 2-9 Propose or support legislation to mandate electronic filing of lobbying
reports by 2010.
Who: Commission, Executive Director, Assistant Director
Timeline: January 2008

3. Promote external communications; evaluate results.

Objective: Increase the number of informed voters.

Strategy: Teach prospective voters how to "follow the money."
[Statewide Result No. 10. Activity: Provide Public Access to
Campaign, Lobbying and Financial Information.]

Action Items:

- 3-1 Develop marketing plan to increase public awareness of PDC – who we are – what we do – why we do it.
Who: Assistant Director, Communications and Training Officer,
Director of Administration
Timeline: January 2008
- 3-2 Educate media in four new cities about web information.
Who: Assistant Director, Communications and Training Officer
Timeline: May 2009
- 3-3 Videotape all PDC training modules for web streaming.
Who: Communications and Training Officer, Systems Administrator
Timeline: July 2008
- 3-4 Publish training catalog with course descriptions and order forms.
Who: Communications and Training Officer
Timeline: December 2007

Objective: Increase public confidence in PDC processes and performance.

Strategy: Communicate how PDC is accountable and responsive.

Action Items:

- 3-5 Commissioners meet with legislative leaders and policy committee members.
Who: Commission, Executive Director, Assistant Director
Timeline: March 2008
- 3-6 Create an “accountability” web page to highlight performance:
- GMAP measures,
 - Overall filer compliance with reporting deadlines,
 - Length of time to resolve complaints,
 - Number of training sessions.
- Who: Assistant Director, Chief Technology Officer
Timeline: December 2007
- 3-7 Make more public records available on website through access to electronic reference manual.
Who: Director of Administration, Application Developer
Timeline: December 2007

4. Increase Commission and staff capacity to meet organizational challenges; evaluate results.

Objective: Increase agency's ability to satisfy public expectations.

Strategy: Communicate resource needs to the Legislature.
[Statewide Result No. 10. Activities: Enforcement of Public Disclosure Laws and Provide Public Access to Campaign, Lobbying and Financial Information.]

Action Items:

- 4-1 Go-live with remote disaster recovery site and obtain funding for site retention.
Who: Commission, Executive Director, Chief Technology Officer, Systems Administrator
Timeline: August 2007
- 4-2 Submit budget proposal requesting and justifying sufficient IT staffing to address project needs and growing service demands.
Who: Commission, Executive Director, Chief Technology Officer
Timeline: August 2006; ongoing
- 4-3 Submit budget proposal requesting increased funding for legal services in conjunction with the Attorney General's Office.
Who: Commission, Executive Director, Sr. Assistant Attorney General, Senior Counsel
Timeline: August 2006; ongoing

5. Develop long-term strategies for legal issues; evaluate results.

Objective: Increase readiness to respond to changing legal environment.

Strategy: Use commissioner expertise to support laws and decisions that are workable and defensible.
[Statewide Result No. 10. Activities: Enforcement of Public Disclosure Laws and Provide Public Access to Campaign, Lobbying and Financial Information.]

Action Items:

- 5-1 Be involved in legislative re-organization of RCW 42.17.
Who: Executive Director, Assistant Director, Senior Counsel
Timeline: Ongoing

- 5-2 Following review of Federal Election Commission action, consider policy options regarding internet campaign activity.
Who: Commission, Executive Director, Senior Counsel
Timeline: July 2007
- 5-3 Make recommendations to the Legislature for simplifying the law; e.g.,
- Determine which parts of law do not fit with mission
 - Make 21-day C-4 report current within one business day
 - Require 24 hour reporting of independent expenditures within 60 days of election.
- Who: Commission, Executive Director, Assistant Director, Senior Counsel
Timeline: January 2008
- 5-4 Develop long-term legal strategy and principles.
Who: Commission, Executive Director, Sr. Assistant Attorney General, Senior Counsel
Timeline: September 2007

Appraisal of External Environment

The workload of the Commission and the public's perception of how well the agency is performing are affected by a number of external factors.

1. Election cycles vary from year to year. For example, local elections are held in odd-numbered years, while state legislative races are held in even-numbered years, and races for the statewide executive offices are held every four years. Special elections for office may be held every year. Typically, there are more election campaigns in the odd-numbered years, approximately 3,000, while between 1,000 and 1,200 candidates seek office in even-numbered years. Furthermore, the number of statewide and local ballot measures before the voters varies greatly from year to year.

Although there may be more campaigns in the odd-numbered years, the contribution limits of Initiative 134 generally do not apply to candidates for local office, and thus the scope of the law that must be administered and enforced by the PDC during those election cycles is narrower than that applied to statewide executive and legislative candidates. However, in local election years, there are more first-time candidates who are frequently unfamiliar with the disclosure law's requirements.

Beginning in 2006, however, per election contribution limits have been extended to all judicial office candidates and to candidates for county and port district offices in jurisdictions with 200,000 or more registered voters; that is, in King, Pierce, Snohomish and Spokane counties and Seattle and Tacoma port districts. Clark County is close to the threshold for registered voters, and likely will meet it in the next year or two.

Depending on the size of the campaigns, complying with these new limits and other restrictions that accompany them (e.g., determining who shares a contribution limit with whom and not spending any general election donations until winning the primary) will be a very real challenge for many of these local office campaigns. It may mean candidates will have difficulty finding volunteer campaign treasurers who are willing to cope with the new demands. It certainly will mean that campaign reports will be closely scrutinized by the opposition because there is more opportunity for potential violations.

In addition, Chapter 240, Laws of 2006, requires candidates in small jurisdictions to file campaign disclosure reports and personal financial affairs statements if they receive or expect to receive \$5,000 or more in contributions. Prior to this change, candidates in cities, towns and special purpose districts having fewer than 5,000 registered voters have been exempt from disclosure requirements regardless of the amount of money raised and spent on their campaigns. It is not possible to anticipate how many candidates will be impacted by this change in law, but the number is expected to be low. The challenge will be to get the message out to candidates in small jurisdictions so they are not caught unaware. The assistance of county election officials will be invaluable in this effort.

2. The length of each legislative session. During the longer sessions in odd-numbered years, there are more lobbyist registrations and reports to process and monitor for compliance.

3. The number of complaints filed by members of the public, “citizen actions” filed with the Attorney General (but investigated and, if necessary, adjudicated under chapter 34.05 RCW by PDC), **and public records requests filed** in connection with enforcement matters and otherwise. These are all matters over which the Commission has no control, but which, for the most part, require prompt attention.

The number of complaints filed by the public has been significantly impacted by the passage of Initiative 134. In FY 1992 (before I-134), 33 complaints were filed by the public, compared to 130 in FY 2000. During FY 2004, 98 such complaints were filed, with 62 submitted in FY 2005. Not only has the sheer number of cases increased, but the investigations and enforcement proceedings that follow from these complaints are longer, more complex, and often result in appeals through the judicial system.

Complainants, respondents, and others who follow the Commission’s enforcement cases have been inclined to serve the agency with public records requests that cover years or decades of documents numbering in the thousands. The inability to promptly provide access to these documents can, as was the case in July of 1998, result in penalties and attorneys fees being assessed against the Commission.

The Commission has also seen an increase in the number of “citizen’s actions” being filed. Twenty-four were filed between September 1996 and December 2005, six times the total number filed during the first twenty years of the law’s existence. These are especially taxing on agency resources because of the strict timelines involved. RCW 42.17.400 allows any person to file a “citizen’s action” in superior court to enforce the Public Disclosure Law if that person has given the Attorney General and county

prosecutor 45 days notice and the officials have declined to act. Although the statute requires notice to be filed with the Attorney General and prosecutors, the PDC, as a practical matter, is brought into these cases. The Attorney General's office relies on the PDC to provide advice and investigate the allegations, and the PDC is billed by the AG's office for its work on these cases.

The nine citizen action complaints filed between 2004 and 2005 severely taxed the limited resources of the PDC, often requiring two or more staff investigators, and jeopardized the agency's ability to set its own priorities. In response, the Commission determined in February of 2006 that these complaints would be evaluated in the same manner as complaints filed directly with the PDC. Those that merit immediate action will receive it; others will be investigated in due course. Complainants who are dissatisfied with this approach would then have to determine whether to proceed to court.

4. Court challenges to campaign finance laws. Notwithstanding the fact that Initiative 276 became law in 1973 and Initiative 134 was effective in 1992, PDC continues to devote considerable public resources to defending long-standing interpretations of these citizen initiatives. Two current legal challenges maintain that the false political advertising statute is unconstitutional. Two others relate to using school district e-mail systems to support a ballot measure. Another lawsuit challenges the constitutionality of the definition of political committee. And, the sixth case relates to the constitutionality of the law's agency fee payer provision. An adverse decision from the Washington State Supreme Court in this case is being appealed by the state to the United States Supreme Court.

The trend of persons who perceive themselves as disadvantaged by provisions of the campaign practices and disclosure law to seek relief in court continues.

In the 2003-05 biennium, PDC's budget was reduced \$330,000 for staff reductions and operating efficiencies. PDC's legal services allotment was cut by \$110,000 as part of the effort to absorb this reduction. PDC will need to restore this funding if the agency is to do a better job of managing the risk associated with implementing a campaign finance law that continues to draw legal scrutiny on behalf of those in-state and out-of-state persons subject to it.

5. Relationships with public officials. The Commission must strike a balance between maintaining an open and beneficial working relationship with the Governor, the Legislature, the Attorney General and other public officers and agencies, while fully and fairly enforcing the law that regulates candidates for those offices, incumbents holding those positions, and the lobbying activity of state and local agencies.

Of primary sensitivity is the fact that the PDC is responsible for regulating candidates for, and members of, the State Legislature notwithstanding the fact that it is the Legislature that sets the Commission's budget and has the responsibility to prescribe the Commission's authority. The PDC risks alienating legislators through the exercise of its authority since Commission action may have a direct, personal impact on members of the Legislature.

The PDC also regulates local officeholders and others within the political system who have access to state officials, such as lobbyists, PAC's, political parties, and contributors.

PDC commissioners and staff must be aware and sensitive to the political environment in which they function, but not intimidated or swayed by it.

6. Relationships with the media. As representatives of the public, the media is the Commission's "biggest customer" in seeking access to campaign information collected and disseminated by the agency. Journalists are also intensely interested in PDC investigations, enforcement hearings, and policies, since they often involve high-profile officeholders and candidates.

Because of their coverage of candidates and officials, the press becomes intimately familiar with the work of the agency, and this scrutiny tends to extend to the operations of the Commission as a whole. Sometimes it's the PDC that becomes newsworthy, not just the candidates or lobbyists it tracks.

PDC personnel must be ever mindful of the fact that the people and entities about whom the agency makes decisions are in the public eye and their reputation has a direct impact on their professional and political careers. Any mistake a staff member makes in advising or investigating persons subject to the law, or even handling their paperwork, may have significant and lasting consequences for that person's career, credibility, and future. In turn, these same mistakes may also have formidable consequences for the agency itself.

7. Relationships with filers. Since its inception, PDC has emphasized customer assistance and training as the primary means for fostering compliance with the law, believing that the vast majority of filers will comply if they know how.

In some respects, when filing meant putting pen to paper and filling in the blanks, it was easier for people not formally schooled in computing. Admittedly, for campaign treasurers, it meant manually adding up contributor aggregate totals and keeping paper records, but filing took no special skill or equipment, just time and commitment.

With the advent of electronic filing, a new dimension has been added. Now hundreds of filers not only need to know what the law requires of them, many of them also need help setting up their computer systems, properly entering data and generating reports. On the days immediately preceding and following filing day, to say nothing of filing day itself, PDC staff literally spend eight to ten hours on the telephone and responding to email messages from often frustrated, sometimes desperate, treasurers and accountants. Electronic filing, for all its benefits – and there are many – can add increased tension and stress to an already demanding disclosure requirement. Care must be taken in order that employees are not overtaxed, while, to the maximum extent possible, filers receive prompt and courteous assistance.

Trends in Customer Characteristics

The most significant trend is that an increasing number of filers and members of the public have access to ever-evolving technological resources and they rightfully expect PDC to utilize the latest technology to meet their needs. This trend requires the Commission to continuously re-examine the ways in which it can best reach and serve these customers, while also recognizing that other customers are less technologically sophisticated and need considerable one-on-one assistance and very intuitive computing products to be successful.

In the 1999-2001 Supplemental Budget, the PDC was appropriated an additional \$674,000 to implement E2SSB 5931, which passed in 1999, and SB 6775, which became law in June of 2000. This legislation mandated PDC to host a Website that provided easy public access to newly filed disclosure reports and data, to offer electronic filing alternatives to filers, and to implement mandatory electronic filing for many candidates and political committees.

These investments permitted the Public Disclosure Commission to meet public and legislative demands for quick access to critical information about political spending in Washington State. The public is now able to “follow the money” and do so in a technologically advanced manner. These investments have also helped filers comply with the law, improved the agency’s overall efficiency through application of modern hardware and software, and given the agency the ability to better communicate with the people it serves.

However, this dependence on technology means there is a concomitant need for funding to maintain and upgrade the agency’s hardware and software products so that they are as reliable and secure as possible. The initial funding in 2000 for information technology equipment did not include dollars for these critical and unavoidable expenses. \$142,000 was secured in the 2005-07 biennium for software maintenance and support, a critical investment in the agency’s core mission.

In its 2007-09 budget request, PDC anticipates seeking ongoing funding to host redundant servers in Eastern Washington in the event of a regional natural disaster or a more localized event (e.g., building fire) that incapacitates the agency’s servers in Olympia. A redundant site would minimize the PDC’s risk of not fulfilling its statutory function while also addressing the public expectation of efficient service.

Strategy and Capacity Assessment

In June 2000, 46 persons filed their PDC reports electronically. Two years later, that number had risen to 370. By March 2006, the agency served 1,954 electronic filers: 345 candidates, 369 political committees, 811 personal financial affairs filers, 311 lobbyists and 138 lobbyist employers. By the time the 2006 campaigns are in full swing, several hundred more candidates and political committees will be filing electronically.

This continual shift to e-filing, while necessary for prompt public access to data, means that additional agency resources are being devoted to questions concerning use of electronic filing software. Part of the long-term solution lies with more sophisticated on-line help screens, tutorials and the like, but filing programs will also have to be systematically upgraded to make them as error retardant and user friendly as possible.

However, it is necessary to recognize that the landscape has changed and the demand for technological assistance from PDC staff will not abate. To better manage this demand, in 2004 the agency created a filer assistance specialist position from what had been an information technology applications specialist position. Of course, since one staff member cannot promptly respond to all callers, the five political finance specialists are expected to have a working knowledge of the filing systems used by campaigns, lobbyists, lobbyist employers and personal financial affairs filers.

In June 2006 the new law imposing contribution limits on candidates for judicial office and candidates for certain county and port district offices goes into effect. With passage of that new law, the 2006 supplemental budget included funding for an additional PDC filer assistant to help candidates and contributors comply with their requirements.

PDC's information technology staff is stretched too thin. Since 2004, the IT division has been developing a new electronic filing program for campaigns. The new system "went live" in February and it represents a vast improvement over the antiquated software that had been in use. Nevertheless, the new system will have to be continually upgraded to respond to filer improvement suggestions and law and rule changes.

In addition, the IT division must also focus on developing an electronic filing system for persons making independent expenditures and electioneering communications, redesigning the website, and enhancing the electronic filing options for personal financial affairs filers as well as lobbyists and lobbyist employers. The IT division has a growing list of critical projects to complete if this technology-dependent agency is to remain current and secure. The IT division is understaffed given the demands placed on it.

Another operational strategy relates to uniformity of enforcement case decisions. When similar violations occur, the Commission is committed to assuring that consistent penalties result. To that end, the Commission has formally adopted five brief enforcement penalty schedules that set out a range of standard penalties for specific violations (primarily late reporting), taking into account a filer's compliance history. As part of its strategic plan, the Commission has also directed staff to emphasize prevention of violations through audits and customer service. Enforcement is a necessary component of any regulatory program. However, it is also time-consuming and expensive to investigate complaints and prepare for and conduct administrative hearings, if necessary. Court action only escalates the cost to taxpayers. The PDC has always put a premium on prompt and reliable customer service. But more can and will be done to prevent violations.

One of the agency's core assets, allowing it to perform its functions effectively, remains the five citizens who are appointed by the governor to lead the PDC. The commissioners are experienced, committed, impartial, and they bring diverse perspectives and skills to their oversight duties. Every year one member's term expires in December and a new member joins the board. This rotation energizes the Commission and the staff and enhances the agency's credibility.

Internal Assessment

As part of its strategic planning effort, PDC commissioners and staff reviewed the agency's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats and identified the following attributes and circumstances as warranting recognition and attention during the coming biennium.

Strengths

- Excellent public access to information.
- Customer service level is high.
- Commission makeup: diverse perspectives – experienced – committed – impartial.
- Enforcement decisions are consistent and fair.
- Staff is reliable, thorough, and effective in supporting commission.
- Agency recruits and retains quality employees who have diverse experience.
- Technology is more current and user friendly.
- AG assistance is excellent -- knowledgeable and efficient.
- Leverage resources well and efficiently.

Weaknesses

- Budget – limited resources affects timeliness of compliance cases and technology advancements.
- PDC is slow in resolving some enforcement matters.
- Strong stakeholder support is not present.
- Audit activity needs to occur routinely rather than primarily driven by complaints.
- Lack of public awareness of PDC and its mission.

Opportunities

- Emphasize accountability and performance measures.
- Use Commission members more to educate targeted groups and the public on PDC mission and role.
- Find a more effective way of processing citizen action complaints.
- Partner with other agencies on training, risk management and legislation.
- Legislative relationships can be enhanced.
- Attract local media to PDC and its work in order to raise public awareness of importance of disclosure laws and to increase utilization of disclosed information.
- Foster enthusiasm and accountability in newly hired staff and make sure they understand and embrace agency's culture of customer service.
- Technology advances will be necessary in order to maintain and improve current systems and filing programs.

Threats

- Litigation challenges to PDC law are continuing.
- More limitations on available resources.
- Three of the agency's six managers may retire in next five to seven years.
- Filer dissatisfaction with antiquated electronic filing programs will erode confidence in agency, delay transition from paper reporting, and result in less useful information available for public consumption.

Performance Assessment & 2007-09 Performance Measures

Washington's public disclosure law and its implementation consistently rank at the top of national surveys comparing state disclosure requirements and public accessibility of information. For example,

- Washington was rated as having the best campaign finance disclosure program in the country in 2003, 2004 and 2005, according to the California Voter Foundation,
- Washington ranked first in all 50 states for financial disclosure laws that apply to members of the legislature (April 2006, Center for Public Integrity),
- PDC's website was nominated for a 2004 Webby Award in the government and law category by the International Academy of Digital Arts & Sciences, and

- Washington ranked first for lobbyist disclosure in a May 2003 survey conducted by the Center for Public Integrity.

The agency's performance reflects the high value that the citizens of Washington and their elected representatives place on open government and access to information. Without their willingness to devote substantial resources to supporting the PDC's mission, it would not be possible for the agency to realize this level of success.

On the following page is a chart showing PDC's most recent performance measure information.

Generally, the agency's actual performance is consistent with expected results, with the following exceptions:

1. Regarding the 2nd measurement, the number of routine investigations that would be received was over-estimated. However, the agency did complete two-thirds of the routine investigations within 90 days, the goal set for these types of investigations. This completion rate compares favorably with FY 2005, when one-third were completed within 90 days. The enforcement division's new case management process appears to be having a positive impact, although more time will be necessary to see if the current trend continues.
2. Regarding the 6th measurement, the number of campaigns using electronic filing during the 2005 elections turned out to be twice the expected number. It appears that some campaigns voluntarily opted for e-filing, while many more campaigns than anticipated needed to file electronically because they reached the \$10,000 threshold in expenditures.
3. Regarding the 9th measurement, the final number of officials using electronic filing for personal financial affairs reporting will likely approach the 2,102 target number since hundreds of filers submit their reports between March 31 and the April 15 due date.
4. Regarding the 12th measurement, as noted in number 2 above, the estimate of the number of local candidates that would file electronically was under-estimated.

Performance Measures – FY 2006 as of March 31, 2006

Goal: Identify and implement strategies to make enforcement efforts more effective

FY 2006 Performance Measure	Target	Actual
Percentage of candidates, political committees, lobbyists, and public officials who meet statutory filing deadlines.	96%	94%
Number of routine investigations completed and percentage completed within 90 days. (Note that 85% were completed within 120 days and 100% were completed within 185 days.)	50 / 45%	27 / 67%

Goal: Enhance public access and awareness of PDC reports and data through technology

FY 2006 Performance Measure	Target	Actual
Number of pages scanned for Internet access	47,000	54,519
Number of times the Commission's Internet site is accessed	700,000	546,437
Average number of days from receipt of electronically filed campaign reports to posting on web site	<1	<1
Average number of days from receipt of paper filed campaign reports to posting on web site	<1	<1
Number of campaigns using electronic filing (reflects candidates and political committees)	500	1,067
Number of lobbyists using electronic filing	281	311
Number of lobbyist employers using electronic filing	200	138
Number of officials using electronic filing for personal financial affairs reporting	2,102	1,233
Percentage of statewide executive candidates who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically	20/80%	22/78%*
Percentage of legislative candidates who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically	15/85%	15/85%
Percentage of local candidates who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically	45/55%	30/70%**
Percentage of continuing political committees who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically	45/55%	42/58%
Percentage of lobbyists who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically	70/30%	70/30%
Percentage of lobbyist employers who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically	80/20%	90/10%

* Based on statewide executive candidates registered for 2008.

**Based on number of local candidates registered for 2006.

Performance Measures – FY 2008

Goal: Identify and implement strategies to make prevention and enforcement efforts more effective

FY 2008 Performance Measure	Target	Actual
Percentage of candidates, political committees, lobbyists, and public officials who meet statutory filing deadlines.		
Number and percentage of routine investigations completed within 90 days.		

Goal: Provide quick and easy public access to information

FY 2008 Performance Measure	Target	Actual
Number of pages scanned for Internet access		
Number of times the Commission's Internet site is accessed		
Average number of days from receipt of electronically filed campaign reports to posting on web site		
Average number of days from receipt of paper filed campaign reports to posting on web site		
Number of campaigns using electronic filing (reflects candidates and political committees)		
Number of lobbyists using electronic filing		
Number of lobbyist employers using electronic filing		
Number of officials using electronic filing for personal financial affairs reporting		
Percentage of statewide executive candidates who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically		
Percentage of legislative candidates who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically		
Percentage of local candidates who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically		
Percentage of continuing political committees who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically		
Percentage of lobbyists who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically		
Percentage of lobbyist employers who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically		

Performance Measures – FY 2009

Goal: Identify and implement strategies to make prevention and enforcement efforts more effective

FY 2009 Performance Measure	Target	Actual
Percentage of candidates, political committees, lobbyists, and public officials who meet statutory filing deadlines.		
Number and percentage of routine investigations completed within 90 days.		

Goal: Provide quick and easy public access to information

FY 2009 Performance Measure	Target	Actual
Number of pages scanned for Internet access		
Number of times the Commission's Internet site is accessed		
Average number of days from receipt of electronically filed campaign reports to posting on web site		
Average number of days from receipt of paper filed campaign reports to posting on web site		
Number of campaigns using electronic filing (reflects candidates and political committees)		
Number of lobbyists using electronic filing		
Number of lobbyist employers using electronic filing		
Number of officials using electronic filing for personal financial affairs reporting		
Percentage of statewide executive candidates who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically		
Percentage of legislative candidates who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically		
Percentage of local candidates who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically		
Percentage of continuing political committees who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically		
Percentage of lobbyists who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically		
Percentage of lobbyist employers who file 1) paper reports and 2) electronically		